

# THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY

A Magazine of Theory and Practice

---

Vol. 30

DECEMBER, 1956

No. 4

---

## EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY; AN EDITORIAL

As educational goals have changed from skills and knowledge to growth and development of people, the role of Sociology in education has become more obvious. The followers of the discipline can be justly proud of the "break throughs" which have been the result of sociological approaches to education. A short list of them may suggest the contribution which has been made:

Acculturation; socialization; social structure, including social class, caste, power and status relationships; the dynamics of groups, inter-group relations; community—both as a dynamic in growth and as a function of power; and last but by no means least the sociology of the profession.

All of these areas are of such significance that no teacher would be considered qualified today without some understanding of them.

The faith of the early pioneers is being justified. Sociology is taking its place along with psychology and the biological sciences as the scientific foundation for education.

DAN W. DODSON

---

Copyright, 1956 by the Payne Educational Sociology Foundation, Inc.

## NEW PROBLEMS IN INTERCULTURAL EDUCATION

Don J. Hager

The threat of Fascism and the advent of the Second World War prompted American educational circles to embark on a type of educational strategy designed to instil mature intergroup attitudes in children and youth—intercultural education. Fifteen years later, a decline is noted in intercultural programming and literature.<sup>1</sup> In part, this decline can be attributed to a shift in the national climate, i.e., from a concern about racism and prejudice to that of the Cold War. In addition, the intercultural emphasis in education is subsumed and practiced under a variety of programs and titles—human relations, social studies, intergroup education, and the like. Beyond, however, the important problems that are likely to arise from a consideration of the history and development of intercultural education, we now need to re-evaluate its capacity to (1) abandon theories, assumptions and practices of questionable validity and (2) to face the problems that are now being generated by the intersection of intercultural education and the separation of church and state.

In general, intercultural education seeks to establish and promote productive intergroup relations within the confines of the school community. The strategic location of the public schools in American society would appear to make them ideal instrumentalities for acquainting the nation's school-age population with the demands and requirements of the democratic expectation. Formal programs in intercultural education seek to achieve this end in three primary areas: (1) *administration*, e.g., organizing the school system on a non-segregated basis, proper teacher selection, etc.; (2) *curriculum*, e.g., through choice and presentation of subject matter, courses in social studies, use of art, drama, song, and visual aids stressing intercultural themes and the democratic ideal; (3) promoting *intergroup contact and communication*, e.g., providing opportunities for contact and exchange among members of the various ethnic, racial and religious groups in a variety of school-sponsored activities. In addition, intercultural education can be manifested in types of programs involving teacher-education, community organizational resources, PTA's, and the like.

---

<sup>1</sup> See: Sidney Z. Vincent, "Intercultural Education: Its History and Philosophy," National Conference on Intercultural Education and Church-State Separation; sponsored by the National Community Relations Advisory Council, April 29, 1956.

Without disputing the desirability of the goals sought by the proponents of intercultural education, the evidence is now more than suggestive that certain of its major assumptions, theories and practices suffer from a lack of clarity and substance. In part, this infirmity is the consequence of several subsidiary deficiencies: the lack of basic data concerning the scope, nature and practice of programs in intercultural education, and inadequate measurement programs for determining the extent to which particular programs and techniques do actually produce the desired result, namely, the reduction of prejudicial attitudes and increasing the student's "capacity to be comfortable about diversities in American life."

#### ASSUMPTIONS AND PRACTICES OF QUESTIONABLE UTILITY

One of the chief difficulties attending the development of intercultural education has been its consistent lack of valid theoretical guides, either social scientific or educational, that can serve as a set of organizing principles as well as a base from which to measure achievement. Intercultural education has yet to develop a systematic body of theory, practice and research. To some extent, this failure is attributable to a lack of clarity regarding aims and consequences. There is confusion as to whether intercultural education is primarily a form of moral instruction ("good citizenship"), a body of techniques and skills, an administrative stratagem, an ethical base for curriculum building or a tactic designed to enhance the "emotional and intellectual growth" of the child. Still others see intercultural education as helping the child to adjust to his "total environment." Some of these emphases are probably beyond the capacities of intercultural education; others are legitimate expectations but faulty conceptualization complicates assessing their merit and contribution.

Certain of the techniques and practices of intercultural education appear to rest on untested or erroneous assumptions about the nature of group differences and intergroup conflict. For example, one such popular assumption is that conflict and tension arise between groups and nations because they do not "understand" one another; therefore, peace and tranquility are best achieved by promoting "understanding" among peoples and groups. The assumption that conflict springs primarily from "misunderstanding" or a "lack of understanding" is buried deep in the literature and method of many well-intentioned intercultural and interfaith programs. This point of view, while widely prevalent, is not substantiated by studies in the etiology and theory of social conflict. Many serious and persistent forms of conflict do not derive from any demonstrable failure to "understand" cultural differ-

ences in tradition, language, religious and historical experience. The sheer fact of cultural, linguistic, racial or religious differences is rarely the chief source of group conflict. Numerous observers have pointed out that wars are fought between nations sharing the same cultural tradition and, in recent years, the cultural differences among allies have been greater than those between enemies. In addition, intercultural education tends to place too much emphasis on "cultural differences"—national cultures and ethnic differences are fast losing their importance in American society as a referent for social identification. They are being replaced by considerations of social class position, education, occupation and residence.

The notion that increased understanding promotes greater friendship among groups suffers from still other deficiencies. It reflects a certain social immaturity in that it assumes that the issues often precipitating conflict between groups are wholly imaginary and without significance, e.g., "After all, Protestantism, Catholicism and Judaism, are *merely* different ways of worshipping the same God." Furthermore, since it promotes the idea that groups in conflict do so because they have the "wrong" social perspective or that they "misunderstand" one another, it is used to justify an over-emphasis on the "educational approach" to problems in group conflict. It is granted that this approach often performs a necessary and useful service; on the other hand, its indiscriminate application tends to ignore the impressive body of evidence that has been accumulated concerning the extremely limited capacity of educational and mass media materials to "change attitudes" or to create "a favorable climate of opinion."

To the extent that individuals and groups become convinced that conflict and hostility are primarily due to a "lack of understanding," to that extent they have permitted themselves to become intellectually disarmed, that is, they become incapable of recognizing or dealing with the economic, political and ideological sources of conflict. Nor is understanding necessary in order to achieve many pragmatically desirable community goals; for example, equality of opportunity in housing. Jews and Gentiles, for instance, need not "understand" one another (in the cultural sense) in order for both groups to subscribe to the principle of equal rights and liberties for all. It is entirely possible for members of different groups to meet on equal-status terms in the pursuit of common objectives without necessarily becoming involved in a program of "mutual understanding."

Intercultural education also appears to be handicapped by the tendency to overwork the device of pointing to the discrepancy between the "Real and the Ideal," that is, between prejudicial and discriminatory behavior on one hand and democratic ideals on the other.



No one denies that this discrepancy exists and Myrdal made it the central theme of his monumental work on the American Negro—"An American Dilemma." But it is mandatory that one do more than point to the discrepancy between ideals and behavior. The problem is to explain why the discrepancy exists (on other than moral grounds). One must analyze social values (ends) and social institutions (means) and attempt to demonstrate, sociologically, why institutional pressures, clashes between values and interests, etc., often actively interfere with the full attainment of social goals.

The educational and ameliorative approach to group conflict overlooks the striking change that has taken place in the theory and strategy of obtaining civil rights and liberties for all citizens, namely, the dramatic successes achieved through legislation and litigation. To some extent, of course, this deficiency is a function of program and commitment. If emphasis is placed on "education," "goodwill," and "brotherhood," then, inevitably, the head-on clash with community power structures is avoided and the use of law and legislation is forsaken on the theory that it promotes rather than reduces conflict. And, thereby, the struggle for civil rights falls victim to the philosophy of placation.

This failure to confront reality in large measure explains why intergroup literature predicated upon commendable liberal sentiments is often transformed into something that dismays rather than attracts. The thrust of much intercultural literature and program appears to be unrealistically directed toward the elimination of conflict rather than toward the development of ideas and sanctions for channelling conflict into *socially productive* communal ends, e.g., safeguarding civil liberties, protecting the right to dissent, etc. The fact is that in a modern industrial democracy, characterized by a large mobile population motivated by socially acceptable (but often conflicting) aims, loyalties and ambitions and imbued with the philosophy of self-betterment and individual worth, conflict is a full and functioning part of the democratic order. Both educators and social scientists seem to have forgotten that conflict is a form of social interaction. Conflict has qualities and properties. It relieves tension. It causes contending groups to modify their claims. It is often the only way that groups can express their opposition to ideas and practices that they abhor. The important task of creating and maintaining a productive social order is not to be accomplished by denying the efficacy of conflict in advancing the commonweal. The positive social value of conflict and dissent, their strategic role in the development of American democracy, plays, unfortunately, a minor role in the contemporary theory and practice of intercultural education and intergroup relations.

**INTERCULTURAL EDUCATION AND THE SEPARATION OF  
CHURCH AND STATE**

Both intercultural education and the field of intergroup relations generally, proceed on the assumption that religious controversy and conflict is similar, in substance and form, to racial and cultural conflict. It is also assumed, therefore, that conventional intergroup theory and practice are equally applicable to the study and reduction of interreligious tensions. Characteristically, there is the tendency to lump racial, creedal, ethnic, nationality, religious, and even class differences, together. This process is followed by the assumption that the same psychological and social dynamics that prompt one form of conflict operates in all contexts. We note, for example, that "interfaithism," i.e., "understanding is best taught through first hand contacts with members of different religious groups," has considerable acceptance in intercultural circles. In dealing with religious differences there is the familiar assumption that "understanding" will remove religious tensions, that religious differences and interreligious conflict share the same character, content and consequences as racial and ethnic differences.

More importantly, too few schools and educators have given serious consideration (in their over-zealous attempts to "prove" that their schools are not "godless") to the extent to which, if at all, the public schools bear a responsibility for religious education and practices. Most of the educational effort appears to be devoted to a premature concern with how religion is to be managed in the public schools—a concern that will not be satisfactorily nor intelligently fulfilled until the question of responsibility is resolved. It is also important to note that many educators and teachers are unaware that certain proposed devices and techniques designed to contribute to "interfaith understanding" seriously threaten the spirit if not the doctrine of the constitutional separation of church and state. In the interest of "religious harmony," intercultural education often becomes enmeshed in programs aimed at "teaching about religion," the establishment of "common core" teachings, and the promulgation of programs in "moral and spiritual values." The involvement of intercultural education in such programs endangers its more legitimate aims, and particularly if these programs promote the use of religious sanctions for moral behavior. It becomes necessary, therefore, to consider the practical consequences as well as the constitutionality of the following classroom practices intended to foster "interfaith harmony and understanding":

- religious and joint holiday celebrations
- reading or recitation of prayers

- reading of the Bible
- the distribution of religious literature
- classroom visits to churches and synagogues
- visits of clergymen to classrooms
- singing sectarian or religious hymns
- use of books, cartoons, and film strips describing the beliefs and practices of the various faiths
- interfaith or sectarian meetings on school premises
- display and explanation of religious symbols

When considering the use of intercultural education to promote "better interfaith relations" in the public schools, it is also necessary to point out that such programs frequently rest upon and perpetuate the erroneous assumption that contemporary religious conflict and controversy has its roots in "religious prejudice and bigotry." This is a point of view that has long been abandoned by serious students of interreligious conflict. The nature of religion and religious conflict has undergone striking change in the last quarter-century. Contemporary religious conflict flows from dispute over church-state relations (religion in the public schools), issues in religious liberty (Sabbath laws), and from the competing demands of the religious and secular worlds. It has long been observed that these forms of conflict persist in the absence of prejudicial attitudes. It is misleading to suggest, for example, that the dispute surrounding the question of Federal aid to parochial schools is attributable to a resurgence of religious prejudice. It is true, of course, that conflict can aggravate and perhaps stimulate prejudicial behavior; but we should not mistake effect for cause.

If we are to assume that one of the central tasks of the public schools is to create respect for the democratic tradition, a tradition that cuts across racial, ethnic and religious membership, we may be inclined to question the advisability or educational programs that lay stress, however well-intentioned, on the racial, religious and ethnic backgrounds of students. For the most part, these characteristics are a function of status and birth; they are not in themselves a measure of individual merit or worth. The objectives of intercultural education might, therefore, be more realistically directed toward examining and exploiting the pragmatic consequences, expectations, and requirements of life in a constitutional democracy.

Dr. Don J. Hager is Research Director, Commission on Community Interrelations of American Jewish Congress, New York City.

## DEMOCRACY AND HIERARCHY: A PROFILE OF FACULTY MEETINGS IN DEPARTMENT "X"

Lloyd P. Williams

Nothing is more prejudicial to democracy than its outward forms of behavior.—*Alexis De Tocqueville.*

The fundamental problem of ethics and politics is that of finding some way of reconciling the needs of social life with the urgency of individual desires.—*Bertrand Russell.*

How despotism arise? That it comes out of democracy is fairly clear.—*Plato.*

### I

This paper is an inquiry into the structure and control of faculty meetings within a specific department of a state university. Fifty-four members of Department "X" in one of the prominent universities of the nation provide the raw material. The data that follows was tabulated by the writer, who was for six years a member of Department "X," and who was thus in a strategic position to gather information in going to faculty meetings without throwing the normal processes of deliberation out of balance. An outside observer brought in for the purpose of studying the meetings would necessarily have put the members of the department on their good behavior and affected a modification in the patterns of participation and dominance.

The occasion of this paper was the repeated assertion of the idea by some members of the staff that "Department 'X' is the most democratic department in this or most any other university." The insistence with which the point was asserted, in conjunction with casual observation, suggested that a systematic attempt to test this declaration might be profitable. And since the faculty of a university department is an organized, primary, permanent, and intentional grouping, an analysis of its structure should be objectively possible.

The basic technique of inquiry is two-fold: (a) tabulation of average participation frequencies over a period of three consecutive meetings, and (b) theoretical analysis based on extended general observation. The frequency tabulation is not only *quantitative* according to professional rank, but is also broken down *qualitatively* to distinguish affective, ceremonial, and technological remarks. The following standards were used in an attempt to arrive at an objective *qualitative* classification of remarks: (a) remarks were judged affective that were principally characterized by emotion and humor, being generally devoid of serious purpose; (b) remarks were judged ceremonial that were platitudinous, deferential, or jargonistic; and (c)

remarks were judged technological that were critical, constructive, analytical, or factual observations designed to modify the basic philosophy and policies of the department or its offerings. In the event characteristics of a given remark overlapped, classification was based upon what appeared to be the principal intent of the remark. Further tabulations were made to ascertain what individuals and/or groups, if any, dominated the parliamentary machinery of the meetings.

Perhaps the point of the greatest weakness in the foregoing approach was the possibility of error and undue subjective interpretation while under pressure to note on prepared tabulation sheets not only the total number of observations or comments but the qualitative nature of each observation as well, while at the same time keeping the general sense of the conservation. The remarks came much more rapidly than was anticipated. The difficulties of on-the-spot qualitative discrimination among remarks was also more difficult than was anticipated. A generally satisfactory solution to both of these problems might be found in the study of recorded faculty meetings, thereby permitting leisurely analysis by two or more critics.

## II

Department "X" assembles for a faculty meeting every two weeks. All members are expected to be present; the chairman's, secretary notes those present and those absent.

The following table reveals the *average number* of times comments, questions, observations, or parliamentary actions were initiated by faculty members during the period of specified observation.

| Rank                 | No. in Department | Frequency of Participation |
|----------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| Professors           | 20                | 172                        |
| Associate Professors | 8                 | 46                         |
| Assistant Professors | 4                 | 1                          |
| Instructors          | 22                | 1                          |

Not only did the professors comment more than three times as frequently as all other ranks combined, but five individuals were responsible for 60 per cent of all comments made by the full professors; the remaining 15 professors made only 40 per cent of the comments. Two associate professors made 69 per cent of the observations; the remaining six staff members at this rank made 31 per cent of the comments. The assistant professors and the instructors averaged only one comment per group.

The following table reveals the *quality* of the comments made by faculty members during the period of specific observation.

| Rank                 | Quality of Comments |            |               |
|----------------------|---------------------|------------|---------------|
|                      | Affective           | Ceremonial | Technological |
| Professors           | 28                  | 144        | 0             |
| Associate Professors | 7                   | 39         | 0             |
| Assistant Professors | 0                   | 1          | 0             |
| Instructors          | 0                   | 0          | 1             |

Seven professors and four associate professors contributed the affective remarks. No affective remarks were contributed by the assistant professors or the instructors. Seven professors and two associate professors contributed most of the ceremonial remarks from their groups.

The following table reveals the average frequency with which staff members initiated or participated in parliamentary procedures during the period of specific observation.

| Rank                 | Motions  |        |          |
|----------------------|----------|--------|----------|
|                      | Initiate | Second | Question |
| Professors           | 4        | 5      | 3        |
| Associate Professors | 1        | 0      | 2        |
| Assistant Professors | 0        | 0      | 0        |
| Instructors          | 0        | 0      | 0        |

There were no points of order called for, no motions were tabled, nor were other standard parliamentary procedures utilized by the faculty during the period of deliberate observation.

### III

The principal factual conclusions of this brief study appear to be:

1. So far as frequency of participation and the concomitant consumption of time is concerned, the professors and the associate professors dominate the faculty meetings. Not only is directive influence concentrated in the upper two professional ranks, but a minority within these ranks gave observable direction to the meetings.

2. The assistant professors and instructors were passive on-lookers, rather than active participants.

3. The control of the parliamentary machinery was completely in the hands of the two upper professional ranks, even though numerically the upper and lower divisions are approximately equal.

4. Affective remarks were numerous; ceremonial remarks predominated; technological remarks were virtually non-existent.

The following analytical conclusions are deduced from the data presented and from the observed facts of organization and structure that appear to characterize Department "X":

1. There is a clique of activists within the department that pre-



empties the available time, provides the principal direction to the conversation, and dominates the parliamentary actions of the group. While it is sometimes amorphous at the edges, this group contains several core members that identifiably play the same role meeting after meeting.

2. This paramount clique, while paying formal deference to democratic techniques, utilize them in faculty meeting to advance ends favorable to themselves, their friends, and their particular professional point of view.

3. Faculty meetings are status getting and status keeping mechanisms. Much of the activity of the dominant clique is directed to status considerations. While frequent comments, observations, and parliamentary actions expand the ego and simultaneously give the feeling of importance and security, this activity also serves the strategic political purpose of assuring the continued dominance of the paramount group.

4. Occasional undercurrents of hostility, latent but nevertheless genuine, characterize the meetings. Any staff member who fails to embrace the departmental orthodoxy will swiftly, albeit it silently, feel the psychological pressures of subtle isolation. Manifestations of heresy are never welcome in faculty meetings.

5. In presiding over faculty meetings, the chairman pays deference to the members of the paramount group; little attention and no deference is shown to the junior members.

6. Departmental meetings are sometimes used as a rubber stamp to approve "democratically and formally" decisions that have already been reached by the paramount clique in consultation with the administrative officers.

7. Three definable attitudes toward faculty meetings characterize the members of the department: (a) an older staff group abetted by a few ambitious youngsters express the attitude that the meetings are important, attending with promptitude and regularity; (b) a majority group of staff members express an attitude of uncritical acceptance, attending from reasons of habit and professional diplomacy; and (c) a minority group of younger staff members express an attitude of critical resignation, attending out of fear that rewards will be withheld if they give expression to their conviction that the meetings are ceremonial and relatively unproductive. Among themselves, this latter group of youngsters habitually voice scathing criticism when the subject of faculty meetings is raised.

8. Staff members with an executive mentality (administrative-manipulative orientation), tend to favor the meetings and to consider them productive; conversely, staff members with a theoretical men-

tality (an academic-scholarly orientation), tend to consider them unproductive.

9. One source of conflict within the department that occasionally manifests itself in faculty meetings is the disinclination of a few independent spirits to subordinate themselves to the paramount group and their concomittant refusal psychologically to accept the status arrangements within the department.

10. Artificial machinery is designed to foster the illusion of amity, joviality, and camaraderie. The prime illustration is an annual meeting of the staff conducted in the spirit of burlesque, buffoonery, and blarney. While nominally an expression of brotherhood, these meetings are more precisely avenues for discharging aberrant emotional energies and for allaying the feelings of guilt and frustration that many members of the staff sense in the presence of many other members.

11. The absence of a single dissenting vote on parliamentary motions suggests the possibility that the issues being decided were inconsequential. However, if the issues were consequential, then the absence of dissent is equally significant in that it suggests intangible yet highly effective restraints were operative. The probability that this or any other like group will arrive at a unanimous decision on five consecutive issues of importance is very low.

12. The disinclination of the entire body of assistant professors and instructors (twenty-six in all) to express themselves affectively suggests that all members of this group are subject to severe emotional inhibitions while in attendance at formal faculty meetings.

13. The frequent recourse taken by the paramount clique to ceremonial remarks suggests an inability to come to grips with fundamental questions. Frequent recourse to affective remarks is perhaps a pathological manifestation of conflict ensuing from the need to assure status and the inability to come to grips with fundamental issues. Hence, the only acceptable remarks are humorous irrelevancies or platitudes.

Generalized conclusions: whereas the faculty meetings of Department "X" are characterized by considerable freedom of speech, the objective fact of the case is that the department is dominated by a minority group; democracy which receives considerable lip service and external attention to form remains in essence specious, presumptive, and partial. Perhaps it is an expression of naive romanticism to lament the fact, but regrettably "the eternal spirit of the populace" permeates even the halls of ivy.

Lloyd P. Williams is Assistant Professor of Education at the University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma.

## **FAMILY LIFE EDUCATION IN SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO TENNESSEE**

**Haskell M. Miller**

Our schools and colleges deserve our sympathy, for they have a staggering task. To teach the old-fashioned 3-Rs alone to the 45 million students they will have enrolled by 1960 would be burden enough, but in our complex and rapidly changing culture where the informal educative processes have broken down or become ineffective in many instances they are continuously being coerced into embracing a growing mass of curricular objectives that seem only remotely related to the traditional 3-Rs.

This may seem regrettable, and one is inclined to feel apologetic when forced to challenge the schools to accept additional responsibilities, but the fact remains that the school with its formal educative processes is the one logical agency to which society must turn for relief from an ever-increasing burden of problems and needs as folkways and mores lose their control and informal education fails to achieve essential objectives. If the burden on the schools is becoming too great, it is to be fervently hoped that the reason lies not in the ultimate impossibility of their performing their herculean duties but in the fact that they are too parsimoniously supported by an as yet indifferent public.

It is the purpose of this report to call attention to the fact that while family life in our society is experiencing terrible disorganization and distress, our schools have taken very little cognizance of the condition. This certainly is not as it should be. The schools are in a strategic position to help strengthen and reorganize family life, and unless they undertake to do so soon in deadly earnestness society will suffer further unnecessary damage and loss.

### *I. The Need for Family Life and Education*

There are many arguments with which to underscore the need for family life education, but space will permit no more than a simple listing of a few of the more potent ones:

1. We are producing divorces at a rate seldom, if ever, equalled in the history of civilization.
2. We are, primarily through neglect of family life, failing increasingly alarming number of our children, as our juvenile delinquency rate clearly indicates.
3. Parental responsibility is being left more and more to a minority of the population who often appear to be the persons least equip-

ped to carry such responsibility—the most isolated, the least skilled, and the least educated.

4. Marriage is growing in popularity and is occurring at increasingly youthful ages, while at the same time it is expected to produce larger and larger dividends on advanced psychic and emotional levels where only a marginal number of the most mature individuals are properly equipped for it.

5. The family is increasing in childlessness and decreasing in size.

6. Considerable social and moral equilibrium is apparently being lost in the realm of sexual behavior.

7. We are perilously near bankrupting the romantic love tradition as a basis for marriage.

8. The proliferation of family welfare services, institutions and foster home programs for children, marriage counseling services, and the like, also give eloquent testimony to the need for family life education.

Though limitations of this report will not permit further extension of this list, it should be obvious to any thoughtful observer, that modern family life represents an area of critical need which education cannot be permitted to continue ignoring to the extent that it has been ignoring it in the past.

On every hand we piously affirm that marriage is sacred and that the home is the most important social institution. We deplore the high divorce rate and frantically cast about for a panacea for the family's failure. At the same time, however, we refuse to do the elementary things which would contribute most to marital stability and family success. If marriage and homemaking are important careers, why do we not put heavy emphasis on the highest attainable standards of preparation for them?

In failing to do this we are committed to a stupid policy which leaves youth to muddle through their dating and courtship experiences and launches thousands of couples on the sea of matrimony every year without the most elementary skills needed to make a success of their marriage.

We expect these unprepared couples to rear the children who will be our future citizens, and we demand that they do a good job of it, but we do not even require them to know anything about such simple fundamentals as nutrition, child care, or the psychology of parent-child relationships.

Agitation for strict divorce laws puts the emphasis in exactly the wrong place. The real need is for more marriage preparation and for stricter marriage requirements.

Specific training for marriage and homemaking, for boys and girls

can and should be initiated. To be worthwhile it should begin with kindergarten and be integrated and continuous through college and graduate school. It should be a major educational objective incorporated in all phases of the curriculum, not just a superficial addition to what has been academically traditional, and it should carefully differentiate between the needs of the sexes in terms of the roles which they must play in successful homemaking.

## *II. Meeting the Need at the Public School Level*

It should not be presumed that there is no interest among educators in meeting this need. As a matter of fact, there is limited but significant evidence of a fairly widespread awareness developing among public school people that family life education is a legitimate object of their concern. It was almost inevitable that this should result from the schools' closeness to increasing tragedy in the family life of pupils, and from the growth of such problems as premature marriages, sex misbehavior, and personality disorders, among their student bodies.

Most public school efforts so far have been of an extremely limited or perfunctory nature, commonly restricted to some type of superficial extra-curricular emphasis or to more or less adequate home economics courses for the girls who elect to take them. The most significant exceptions to this pattern have been in a few situations where unusual community interest has been aroused to support experimental programs aimed at the need, and in several instances where state vocational education boards have seen fit to allocate some of the state and federal vocational funds for the purpose.

For some time the U. S. Office of Education has been trying to stimulate and encourage interest in family life education through numerous channels. It has made the services of a specialist available to local school boards through state departments of education to assist with the planning and evaluation of community family life education programs. A limited number of such special community programs have been developed in several states, usually with state and federal vocational education funds made available to local school boards as reimbursement for part of the salary of a person to serve in the school system as a local coordinator of family life education. Such funds have ordinarily been available for part of the salary only and not for for program expenses. Local school boards and sometimes the Community Chest or the United Fund have supplied the balance of the cost.

Tennessee is among the majority of states not specifically encouraging such a broad use of vocational funds for the development of

experimental programs in family life education. Her near neighbor, North Carolina, has pioneered in this respect, however, as have not-very-distant Missouri and Oklahoma. In such states there has been at least a limited amount of branching out beyond the usual routine offerings in home economics courses. It appears, however, that no state in the nation has as yet developed a comprehensive state-wide program specifically focused on education for family living. The only really exciting developments have to do with experiments in local communities.

There should be some value in our taking the time to review the outline of a few of these experiments.

The Asheville, North Carolina, program has received considerable publicity and has been quite successful. It began in 1944 with the city school board's decision to use some of its federal and state vocational funds to employ a co-ordinator of family life education, and rapidly expanded through the organization of a community-wide Family Life Education Council. Supplementary funds were secured at first through contributions privately solicited, but the Council is now an accepted beneficiary of the United Fund of Asheville and Buncombe County. The school co-ordinator serves as executive of the Council, and a broad program has been developed to include community-wide family life education for parents, teachers, and students. So successful has the Asheville program been that Charlotte, a sister city, recently launched a very similar one and has already achieved considerable success with it.

The Kansas City, Missouri, public schools have a program with a somewhat different historical development. It was begun in 1900 by a group of mothers who wanted the opportunity to learn more about children, became a part of the local PTA movement in time, was served for a number of years by a Director of Parent Education on the staff of the Kansas City Teachers College as a part of the public school system, and is now embraced in the Department of Family Life Education, which is one of four departments (the others being Homemaking, Industrial Arts, and Vocational Education) in the Division of Practical Arts of the public school system. A full year course on preparation for marriage and family living is offered to senior students in most of the high schools, and qualified discussion leaders are employed by the Board of Education to conduct classes each year for considerably more than a hundred parent education study groups throughout the community. It is financed by vocational funds and by fees paid by participants in the adult study groups.

Reports from Tulsa, Oklahoma, indicate that a course on home and family living has been successfully operating in the public schools



there for more than twenty-five years. A Director of Adult Education and a Supervisor of Home and Family Life Education are also included on the school system's administrative staff.

Audubon Junior High School in Los Angeles, California, seems to have developed one of the most unique and significant programs as yet attempted by a local school.<sup>1</sup> It was launched in 1948 after two years of careful planning by teachers, administrative consultants, professional specialists in various fields, parents, and civic leaders. It is a practical, integrated program for life adjustment and family life education geared to the needs of young teenagers and so painstakingly planned that its curricular materials are fitted into practically all departments of the school at the grade level positions deemed most appropriate in terms of the needs and interests of the students. Uniqueness of the program inheres primarily in the fact that it is at the junior high school level, that it was well planned before being inaugurated, that it is thoroughly integrated into the entire curricular program, and that it has been carefully publicized and interpreted so as to receive favorable responses from parents, pupils, and community.

Though Tennessee has underway no experiments comparable to these examples in other states, there are indications that the schools of the state are beginning to be aware of the need to educate for marriage and family living. This awareness was at least dimly reflected in the fact that new regulations for teacher certification adopted by State Board of Education in 1953 specified that nine of sixty quarter hours of training in the General Education Core should be in "Health, Personal Development, or Home and Family Living."

In the spring of 1955 a questionnaire concerning emphases on family life was mailed to 73 Tennessee high schools, representing every major incorporated community in the state. Of the forty replies received, thirty-five were from public schools and five from private. Only six schools were offering to both boys and girls any kind of course designed specifically as preparation for marriage, homemaking, or family living. Nineteen others claimed courses for girls only. Most of the courses were entitled "Home Economics," though two had the title "Human Relations," one "Future Home Makers," one "Family Living," two "Family Relations," and one "Sociology." Enrollment was apparently voluntary in all cases, and out of an average student body of 755, an average of three boys and 122 girls were taking the course in the schools where one was offered.

Less than half of the forty schools reported any type of extra-

---

<sup>1</sup> See Articles in *California Journal of Education*, January, 1950, and November, 1953.

curricular activity pointed toward the need of pupils for guidance in matters pertaining to dating, courtship, and preparation for marriage.

It was agreed by thirty-seven of the forty principals sending in the replies that there was need for inclusion of more emphasis on these matters in their educational objectives and curricular offerings. Among reasons given were: "too many high school boys and girls marrying without sufficient thought of the responsibilities involved," "unhappy homes, emotionally disturbed children, delinquent children," the lack of guidance and interest in the home," and "alarming divorce rate." A few added such comments as "it would be desirable to have more of a good thing, but only a limited portion of all the desirable things can be included in the program of a particular student," "the trouble is lack of trained personnel," "if we could find the time to teach it," and "special training for teachers might be a starting point." Three principals indicated that either they or some of their faculty did not believe this to be a school responsibility, and one said, "I have not considered this to be an area of urgent concern."

Extent of the problems occurring in the schools was suggested by reports of eleven marriages during the year in one school, nine and an illegitimate birth in another, and eight in another.

### III. *Meeting the Need at the College and University Level*

The record of our colleges and universities is not much better than that of our public schools.

The first so called "functional" course in marriage was offered in 1927 at the University of North Carolina by the late Dr. Ernest R. Groves. Since that time similar courses have been introduced in more than half of the institutions of higher education. Because little academic emphasis is placed upon them, however, they vary greatly in quality and are elected by only a small per cent of the student bodies.

In a national survey conducted in 1949 Bowman found marriage education courses were being offered in 632 out of 1,270 colleges responding. On the basis of the enrollment data obtained, he estimated that about two per cent of all United States students in college in 1949 were taking the courses and that this would result in about eight per cent benefitting from such offerings sometime during their four years of college. This, as Bowman pointed out, was roughly equivalent to the number of students who would never marry.<sup>2</sup>

The Committee on the Teaching of Sociology of the Southern

---

<sup>2</sup> Henry A. Bowman, "Marriage Education in the Colleges," *Journal of Social Hygiene*, December, 1949.

Sociological Society, using Bowman's questionnaire, did a thorough follow-up survey of colleges in eleven southern states in 1951-52.<sup>3</sup> Responses were received from 220 out of 358 colleges, and indicated that approximately five per cent of southern college students, most of them women, had been in a marriage or family course during the preceding year. No such course was offered in fifty-six of the colleges responding, and in only 12.1 per cent of those where it was offered was it a required course. In less than half of the southern colleges (107 of the 220) was the course reported to be a specifically functional one in preparation for marriage. As a matter of fact, the study indicated that southern faculties, like those in many other parts of the country, were inclined to be either indifferent to functional courses or openly skeptical of their value. Very little was being done in any of the southern colleges to prepare prospective teachers in the field of marriage and the family.

A cursory check of the catalogues of twenty-eight of the thirty-one colleges belonging to the Tennessee College Association shows that three offer no course on marriage or the family, nine offer a combination course stressing both institutional and functional emphases, six offer a course with institutional emphases and a separate course with functional emphases, eight cover institutional emphases only, and two have strictly functional courses. In no case was a course in marriage or the family a part of the required "core curriculum."

There is on the national scene, let it be noted, a small hopeful sign of promise in the fact that a few graduate schools are tardily and timidly undertaking to develop programs for the training of family educational specialists, marriage counselors, and the like.

It is dramatically evident, however, that the colleges as a whole have not taken marriage and family education seriously.

### *Conclusion*

The inevitable conclusion to be drawn from such a survey as this is that the formal educational process is woefully tardy in keeping up with this important aspect of need in our changing society.

Educators as individuals seem to be vaguely aware that something educational should be done to strengthen marriage and the family, but the schools as administrative units are confused and reluctant. Administratively, most students are being dealt with in our educational system as though they are all neuter and will be permanently

---

<sup>3</sup> "Education and Family Relations in Southern Colleges," *Social Forces*, October, 1953, Vol. 32, No. 1, pp. 61-65.

celibate, or as though in the realm of marriage and family life they cannot be helped but must be left to the uncertain mercies of a whimsical providence which cannot be approached through the channels of reason. At this point, at least, the schools seem altogether too content to leave us in the "dark age."

From one point of view, it might, of course, be said that the problem has been developing so rapidly in our fast changing society that the schools have not had time to adjust to the need, and that the academic developments which have occurred show that the schools are sensitive to the need and are groping their way toward a solution.

Though there is much truth in such an observation, it is nevertheless obvious that not enough enthusiastic conviction is being expressed in the academic efforts to date. It is fairly obvious that schools can and should provide a thorough education for marriage, and that in order to do so they must begin with the child early and stay everlastingly at the task. As Dr. Paul Popenoe has said, however, the chief difficulty is that "nobody is willing to take the initiative in finding a place for this education in our school curriculums." Dr. Popenoe added, significantly, "Administrators, generally, are from the old school of thought, and are unaware that the home pattern is being destroyed."<sup>4</sup> Probably he should have said that either this is true or else administrators have no faith in education's capacity to deal with complex issues so dynamically related to life situations in modern society.

---

<sup>4</sup> From Associated Press News feature, October 19, 1945.

Haskell M. Miller is head of the Department of Sociology, University of Chattanooga, at Chattanooga, Tennessee.

---

## COOPERATION IN ACTION RESEARCH: A RATIONALE

Abraham Shumsky

The literature speaks about individual and cooperative action research as distinct processes. In most cases, however, even the so called individual action research will tend to have important elements of cooperative work. These elements may range from a setup where a group is working on a common problem, to a setup where the members share a major interest but work on individual problems. The latter utilize the group for consultation and support. It is this element of *cooperation* in action research which is the major topic of discussion in this article.

**THE PROBLEM OF BELONGINGNESS AND SELF DIRECTION**

Science and technology opened fabulous resources, conquered space; disease and natural forces and made poverty unnecessary. At the same time, however, science and technology are a mixed blessing. They created problems of cultural adjustment, huge in magnitude and depth. No wonder that students of social foundations of education point out that every significant educational problem stems from the general problem of social reintegration created by the industrial era. (10)

The purpose here is not to paint a hopeless picture of the impact of the industrial era on present society, but to point out that in spite of great strides in the material and physical aspect of man's living, he is faced with old and new problems in the area of relationship among man and man's relation to himself.

The problem of the mental health of the modern man is discussed by Durkheim in his classic study *Le Suicide*. His basic thesis is that the progressive division of labor in modern society, despite its material advantages, decreases group cohesiveness, and consequently interferes with the individual's happiness.

People no longer feel sure about what is possible and what is not, what is just and what is unjust, which claims and aspirations are legitimate and which go beyond measure... thus the appetites of men being no longer under restraint by public opinion now bewildered and disoriented, do not know where the bounds are before which they ought to come to a halt. (3, p. 38)

These people feel that they have no real friends to confide in, to give and receive affection and from whom to derive moral strength. The result is a tendency toward suicide.

Erich Fromm (4) is another penetrating scholar who contributed toward the understanding of the mental health problem of the modern man. Fromm claims that modern man despite being free from the bonds of pre-individualistic society, has not gained freedom, full realization of his potentialities and real self-directiveness. The pre-individualistic society limited man, but at the same time gave him security and a feeling of belongingness. Modern society led man to more independence, mastery of nature, and rationality. Simultaneously, however, modern civilization made man isolated, anxious and full of doubts concerning himself and the aims of life.

A comparison between the medieval and present society may illustrate Fromm's thesis.

The medieval society was characterized by lack of individual freedom. Everybody was chained to the social status into which he was born. Man had little chance, if any, to move from one class to another.

He could hardly change his place of residence from one town to another. The personal, social and economic life of the individual was regulated and highly structured. Man accepted the social order as a natural order, and having a well defined role in it fostered a feeling of security and belongingness.

Modern man is much freer. His role in life is not fixed, to the same extent, by his group origin. Man may compete and try to improve his lot by capitalizing on his inner resources and potentialities.

In practice, however, there are many blocks which interfere with the development of man's spontaneity and creativity. For instance, in the economic sphere, man has become a cog in a large machine, an automaton who is always told what to do and has little opportunity to develop genuine initiative on the specific job he is doing. Strong roots of tradition tend to keep man in an inactive and passive position. Fromm's conclusion is very gloomy. Modern man

has been freed from traditional authorities and has become an "individual," but at the same time he has become isolated, powerless and an instrument of purposes outside of himself, alienated from himself and others... This state undermines his self, weakens and frightens him. (4, p. 270).

Relying of "the crutch of dogma... to relieve them of the trouble of thinking and the responsibility of directing their activity by thought," (2, 394) is not of much help in a changing society. The old methods of living do not apply, and new ways are yet unknown. These conditions are a source of frustration and pessimism, mainly because man has not been trained in cooperative experimentation.

#### **COOPERATION IN ACTION RESEARCH AND GROUP BELONGINGNESS**

An action research movement is potentially a grass roots approach to the solution of community problems. It means activating the social and spiritual life of the community in a continuous search for self-improvement. It means providing a social setting where people can work together, dream together of a better community, and try to translate their dreams into the language of action and evaluation.

With the centralization processes of modern society and with the passing of a decentralized society of the town meeting, it becomes increasingly important to provide people with opportunities for cooperative projects. (5)

Cooperation on an action research project may fulfill many needs in the life of the modern man. It provides a setup for creating new primary groups and it generates a feeling of relatedness. Man may suffer from hunger and physical pain but he finds that the worst of



all pains is aloneness and isolation. (4). Man is a group man, his life is a group life.

#### COOPERATION IN ACTION RESEARCH RELEASES CREATIVITY AND CRITICAL THINKING

Working together on a common problem is a source of security, status and recognition. The participant learns that he is not an ugly duckling who has "problems." He finds that to a great extent these problems are common and shared by other people. The individual accepts having a problem not as a stigma, but as a normal aspect of living. He is helped in releasing his blocked creativity and in channelizing his mental and emotional energy toward improvement and progress.

The stimulation that comes from group contact helps to overcome inertia and self-defeatist attitudes. The fear of failure is lessened and an attempt to embark on an intelligent action is more possible.

The introduction of innovations in the area of social relations calls for much vision and abstract thinking. Studies (8) point out the effectiveness of group as compared with individual thinking in terms of more ways of looking at the problem, more suggestions for solutions and more analysis and criticism of the suggested plan.

In brief, group work is conducive to the release of potential creativity and in promoting social vision, inspiration and critical thinking. These attributes are much needed by the action researcher faced with social problems.

#### COOPERATION IN ACTION RESEARCH PROMOTES CHANGE

Trying something new and different is always somewhat risky. It is possible to hypothesize, but it is impossible to be sure in advance what will happen when changes will be introduced. When the group as a whole is taking the risk, the risk of the individual is considerably reduced. (1)

Studies in group dynamics point out that it is easier for individuals to change as members of a group than it is for them to change as individual members, isolated from others. Lewin (6) found that the dependence of the individual on a valued standard and norm interferes with the attempt of change from that standard. On the other hand, when group norms change, the same dependence on group values will facilitate change in the individual and will strengthen his decision to *continue* with the new group norms of behavior.

The people who want to grow and change have to be involved in every aspect of the study, from the identification of the problem to the stage of generalization.

A cornerstone of the action research movement is its criticism

of traditional research for trying to initiate change through dissemination of research results, rather than through the involvement of more people in the process of research.

Research has too often failed because of lack of cooperation between the researcher and the consumer. A common reason given for non-acceptance of research results is that "it is not applicable to *my situation*." The "solution" to the problem is in terms of the producers' rather than the consumers' orientation. The cooperative search for plans of action assures that the research results will be realistically oriented and applicable to the lives and situations of the participants. (5)

In conclusion: a basic belief of the action research movement is that a promising way of initiating and securing change is by involving the potential consumers of the research results in the planning, analysis and interpretation of the research data, (1, 7)

#### COOPERATION IN ACTION RESEARCH PROMOTES CONSENSUS

Unfortunately it is an accepted practice, in negotiating a conflict, to try to blast the opponent by vehement speeches. Under cooperative action research conditions, the individuals involved may have more readiness to approach the problem objectively.

Passow, Miles, Corey and Draper (9 p. 143) analyze the desired behavior of the action researcher in group situations. The action researcher is a person who does not feel that he has all the facts and knows all the answers. He tries to gather facts and carefully assess and delineate the problem. Rather than resorting to propaganda techniques, he tries to ask and search for evidence when he himself or other members present opinions. Rather than having a pre-designed solution, and predefined judgments, he states solutions tentatively as hypotheses to be tested. He withholds judgments and conclusions until evidence is collected and analyzed.

Rather than relying on oratorical techniques suited to winning contests, or using psychological maneuvers of war of nerves, the action researcher avoids pushing and manipulating the group for quick results. He is sensitive to the feelings of the group and to the group's readiness to take various actions. Rather than being interested in pushing his platform and blocking the considerations of other views, he tries to help the group explore the wider context of the situation and the broader ramifications of various solutions.

This description points out that cooperative action research can not be seen as a methodology, in the narrow sense of the word, but rather as a new approach to ways of behavior in group situations, and a new philosophy of cooperative work.

Taking the position that action research is potentially a major

## CONCLUSIONS

avenue for the betterment of the lot of the individual and the group, the present article started with some of the basic socio-psychological problems confronting modern man.

The problems are the mental health of the individual, his relations to the group, and his right for self directiveness and creativity.

The article pointed out that cooperative action research tries to meet these challenges by:

- (1) promoting group belongingness;
- (2) fostering creativity and critical thinking;
- (3) promoting change and growth; and
- (4) serving as a means of resolving social conflicts.

Education is challenged to develop broad minded and intelligent citizens: people who are able to work on social problems cooperatively, not with a desire to push partisan programs, but rather with readiness to test and examine one's own beliefs and practices through *systematic* and objective methods.

Cooperative action research is based on the belief that the future of democracy depends on the full realization of the individual's potentialities and on the development of his ability to work cooperatively with his neighbor on their common problems.

1. Corey, Stephen, M. *Action Research to Improve School Practices*. New York, Bureau of Publication, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1953.
2. Dewey, John. *Democracy and Education*. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1916.
3. Durkheim, E. *Suicide*. New York Free Press, 1951.
4. Fromm, Erich. *Escape from Freedom*. New York, The Rinehart Company, 1941.
5. Leavit, Howard. "Leadership in Action Research as Curriculum Development." Ed. D. Thesis. New York, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1953. Typewritten.
6. Lewin, K. "Dynamics of Group Action." *Educational Leadership*, January 1944.
7. Lippitt, Ronald. *Training in Community Relations*. New York, Harper and Brothers, 1949.
8. Murphy, Gardener and Newcomb, Theodore. *Experimental Social Psych.* New York, Harper and Brothers, 1937.
9. Passow, A. Harry and others. *Training Curriculum Leaders for Cooperative Research*. New York, Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1955.
10. Smith, B. Othanel, Stanley, William O., and Shores, J. Harlan. *Fundamentals of Curriculum Development*. New York, World Book Company, 1950.

Abraham Shumsky is with the Horace Mann-Lincoln Institute of Teachers College, Columbia University.

## THE FUTURE CHALLENGES SECONDARY EDUCATION

Maurice P. Moffat and Stephen G. Rich

Secondary education is destined to assume even greater responsibilities in the challenging future. This important segment of our educational structure now needs be evaluated in terms of emerging demands. The growing needs of secondary education's expanding population require that educators begin reviewing our present facilities and programs. A long range view should guide those looking toward the next decade and beyond. Much sound thinking, adequate research, capable leadership, and concrete planning are essential for better understanding the future needs at this level. New concepts relating to secondary education will emerge to fit the demands in our future civilization.

Surveys indicate a steady rise in the number of young people who will attend our secondary schools. It is further indicated that this influx of pupils will be greatly accelerated by 1960-1965. Thus, the Federal Office of Education predicts a 36 per cent increase in collegiate enrollment by 1965. Of this, we may presume that half will be at junior college level, and hence within the scope of secondary education as now conceived. These urgent, staggering realities present a challenge to every community and state. The problem is not one of "wait and see," but one calling for immediate action to insure adequate preparation. Some school districts are alerted to this situation and have projected their building plans accordingly.

The situation will call for more than new school plants, additional classrooms, and modern equipment. It requires that thought be given to reviewing as well as forecasting the function of secondary education. This may mean one, two, or four years of further education for our youth. In fact, it might be proper to think of the fourteen year program or the junior college. Will terminal education for many follow a pattern of extending our programs upward? Instead of the present high school structure can we envision the upper high school with one or two additional years being added?

In looking to the future the secondary school must serve not only those for whom high school is terminal, but also those students who will enroll in junior colleges. This requires that educators start giving continuous thought to the emerging educational problems and needs of individuals in our own communities. This topic is discussed fully in *The Public Junior College*.<sup>1</sup>

The emerging demands of modern society have been extending

---

<sup>1</sup> *The Public Junior College*, National Society for the Study of Education, 55th Yearbook, Part I (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1956).

youth's needs to some form of post-secondary education. The junior college is an institution of service for providing youth of any area with a program including general education, vocational training and advanced study. Such an institution can prove valuable to those communities where specific industrial, agricultural and educational needs are readily met.

The field of community services is becoming a matter of educational importance. Training for adult life and the responsibilities of a good citizen rank high as features of post-high-school education. Recent trends point toward a greater articulation between the secondary school and the junior college. Thus we recognize the functional contributions the junior college can make to the life of any community.

Our present soaring school enrollments are paralleled with sharp increases in educational costs. Some communities are entering into new regional districts where regional secondary school construction is under way. Such combines are popular and under consideration in different ways, in various parts of the country. But this is by no means the whole story of rising costs. Other increased costs are caused by: additional bus routes, expanding maintenance costs as the schools attempt to do more than hitherto, teacher salary increments, new equipment, additional supplies beyond those formerly sufficient—and rising debt services as more or better schools plants are required. To all this must be added a further factor: the steady inflation of our money, which has averaged 3 per cent a year since the days of King Arthur and his Round Table. We are now in a period of rapid inflation, as compared with the lag thereof in the 1920's.

Both the White House Conference, and communities up and down the nation, have grappled with and continue to work on, some of our pressing issues. At the secondary level, the following seem to us the problems of more immediacy or more significance: we classify them for convenience of thinking.

*Group 1: Problems of Objectives and Curriculum.* What do we intend our schools to accomplish for the whole pupil population? Will technological changes, and scientific advances necessitate that we place new emphases within the content offered in our future courses? Will the very nature of our vocational offerings assume a new significance? Will the results of advances in use of atomic energy, and of automation, have a direct bearing on the curriculum? Will the type of guidance that we today provide, fit the varied needs of youth in the decades to come?

In this group further: Have we given study to a broad-sweep of general education? Will the areas of social sciences, physical science,



humanities and mathematics become more specialized and deeper in scope? Will more emphasis be placed on living in tomorrow's society where, it is predicted, more time will be available for leisure?

*Group 2: Problems of finance:* Here we have just one problem, which must be stated in two parts, and which has long been acute. Whence can we derive the increasing amounts needed to support adequate secondary schools in each community? What untouched sources of income for the schools can we find? . . . and how manage to tap them?

Under finance, two corollary questions crop up, however. One is: Does residential real estate, not bringing income, bear an unfair share of the tax burden for schools? Should industries and businesses be persuaded to carry a larger share of the cost of secondary and higher education?

*Group 3: Staffing and Staff Preparation.* How can we obtain *and hold* good teachers for the secondary schools? Will additional and specially trained personnel need to be added to our staff at this level? Will the advances in use of atomic energy and the spread of automation have a direct bearing on the curriculum for educating secondary teachers? Should the time of preparation for teachers be extended a full year? Should an extended period of cadet teaching be insisted upon? Do we need to give more thought to preparing teachers with the skills of essential for effective experimentation and research into the educative process itself? Should we emphasize the importance of leadership, and the real value of pioneering for new knowledge and for improving methodology? Will more experience in the actual workings of society, and industrial knowledge, be useful additions to our teacher training program? To get these needs met, what parts of the accepted scheme of professional education, dare we jettison to secure the needed time?

*Group 4: Housing and equipment.* What are, first of all, our present needs for new housing and facilities, merely to cope with the present number of students and variety of instructional content? Then: what are the foreseeable future needs? How far beyond those needs foreseen now, must we plan, to have the needed physical and financial leeway to meet unexpected new needs?

*Group 5: Community Interactions.* What is the actual, and what the intended role, of our secondary schools in the modern community? How can we stimulate and sustain community interest in the work of education? How can mutual interest and understanding be fostered between secondary school and community? Will the community's needs cause present instructional programs to be greatly expanded, and additional services added? If so, in what directions?



*Group 6: Teaching.* Will, in facing the new problems, the teaching process be changed to enrich the learning process? What changes will need to be made in such fields as methods, procedures, techniques, devices and audio-visual materials used by teachers? Will the oldest of all visual aids, the well-written book, with style that makes its reading joyful even to the most immature pupil, continue to play a significant part?

*Group 7: Administration.* What changes need we make, to organize and operate our schools with less lost motion? How make an administrative scheme that will forestall loss of student personnel from the influence of bettered secondary education?

Beyond this group of questions come a few sure judgments.

The curriculum for the secondary school must be and remain flexible, in fact rather fluid, to serve pupils entering a changing society. For this purpose, every school system really needs a curriculum coordinator, whose work is to survey, and to direct the course of change in, the curriculum.

As our graduates are entering an age of rapid technological change, based on speedy scientific change, we are compelled to be ever alert to readjust our institutional programs to the "signs of the times." We are challenged, thus, to construct a program in which teachers will be always alert to add desirable material—likewise to discard that which has ceased to be serviceable. No matter how "time-honored" any item of any subject, it must be judged by its possibility of being serviceable—and either rejected or retained on that ground alone.

We are forced to begin to think in terms of community and state resources bringing into our programs those valuable springs of help, people from industries, business and the professions who can provide practical first-hand knowledge for our pupils.

At this point, logic drives us to consider some type of a core arrangement in our instructional programs. A core will give fullness to our instructional patterns and serve to broaden each student's concept of living effectively in society. All the basal content areas should furnish knowledge and functional experiences for every pupil. Many school systems have hesitated to explore the possibilities of a core program. Schools of Education thus must take the lead in offering courses and leadership in all phases of the core practice. We need to train teachers for competence in a core program. We should organize workshops and discussion groups for giving guidance to those schools looking forward to a core program.

Effective guidance will become most important at each step in the program. This will necessitate more counseling for those seniors

who are about ready to leave the school. Every school system should institute a guidance service extending beyond graduation, a personnel service to those in the upper secondary levels, similar to that furnished in many industries.

With the problems and rapid changes facing secondary education, one source of direction is our schools of education. Many such schools have a laboratory school as a phase of the educational program.

A modern laboratory school is the "pulse" of a good teacher training program. It is a place where master teachers are using experimental techniques to expand the frontiers of education. It is from this type of setting, "the skilled teacher's research center" that some of the practices for better instruction are evolving. There is freedom for the study, and testing of techniques, for using various devices and audio-visual materials in the hope of bringing new practices to the attention of those working in education.

Schools of Education need to make every effort to enlarge laboratory school facilities and provide equipment conducive for experimentation and research. Furthermore, adequate funds need to be made available for the publication of work undertaken, in the form of reports of experiments and projects that have proven effective. It is intended that prospective and experienced teachers will study this literature.

Observation of the work at a laboratory school can do much to inspire teachers to attempt some type of exploration in their own particular situation. Thus the modern laboratory school can serve as an "outpost" for tomorrow's secondary education.

To conclude and sum up: our thought in this article is that the present situations is forcing upon us specific needs for new directions, at the secondary level in particular. The planning to cope with these demands is of necessity derived from several avenues of interest. We have here expounded in particular the moot problems and have indicated the role of the experimental school. This last has had mention at special length for two good causes. One is that up to now, such schools have operated mainly in the elementary field. The other is that results of their work have up to now had insufficient communication to the practitioners of education.

We emphasize that cooperation from outside of education as a profession, and in particular from the resources of industries and business, is essential in shaping secondary education for the future.

Maurice P. Moffat is Chairman, Departement of Social Studies, Montclair State Teachers College, and President of The Payne Educational Sociology Foundation, Inc. Stephen G. Rich is a member of the Board of Trustees, The Payne Educational Sociology Foundation, Inc.

## COLLEGE AS A FACTOR IN OCCUPATIONAL CHOICE: A STUDY OF DIFFERENT PERCEPTIONS BY FARM AND NONFARM YOUTH

Herman M. Case

Ginzberg *et. al.* in *Occupational Choice* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1951), speaks of processes of occupational choice as passing through three periods: The *fantasy*, the *tentative* and the *realistic*. According to Ginzberg, this latter period begins about the age of 17, approximately beginning of college age. Thus, college years are the years when realistic action choices of occupations will be made.

It is well known that the probability of attending college is lower for farm than for nonfarm boys.<sup>1</sup> Kolb and Brunner write that:

"Despite the progress made in rural education in the last decades, there is every indication that there is now more inequality in educational opportunity between rural and urban America than there was at the close of the Civil War."<sup>2</sup>

Landis, using 1942 data for the state of Washington, the locale of the present study, shows that this educational inequality is true for both boys and girls, that there is an inverse relationship between size of home town and educational achievement.<sup>3</sup> Davies, using 1940 census data, confirms this finding but indicates that Washington is above the U. S. average for all residence groups.<sup>4</sup> However, even assuming equal educational opportunities, there is evidence that farm youth would attend college in smaller proportion than nonfarm youth. For example, in surveying high school seniors in the state of Washington in 1947 Elias found that the farm group of youth least often

<sup>1</sup> The more conventional breakdown of rural-urban is not used in this paper. Review of the data in the analysis of academic and occupational choice behavior disclosed very few items for which the patterns of response were meaningful either in terms of concept of a rural-urban continuum or in terms of the concept of a rural-urban dichotomy. It was found, however, that occupational rather than purely residential influences have been important in the formation of concepts of and attitudes toward college and occupation. As a consequence, the dichotomy of farm-nonfarm residence is utilized here as the heuristic frame of reference.

<sup>2</sup> J. H. Kolb and Edmund De S. Brunner, *A Study of Rural Society*, New York; Houghton Mifflin Co. (1952), p. 318.

<sup>3</sup> Paul H. Landis, *The Territorial and Occupational Mobility of Washington Youth*, Washington AES Bulletin 449 (1944), pp. 52-53.

<sup>4</sup> Vernon Davies, *Farm Population Trends in Washington*, Washington AES Bulletin 507 (1949), pp. 28-29.

planned to continue their education after high school graduation, compared with other socio-economic groups.<sup>5</sup>

Since farm youth have empirical odds against their going to college, it is hypothesized that those who do matriculate are substantially different from nonfarm youth in their approach to college. The question here, specifically stated, asks: *Do college boys with a farm background perceive the academic role of college in the process in occupational choice and preparation differently from nonfarm boys?*<sup>6</sup>

#### METHODOLOGY

Data designed to give at least partial answer to this question were obtained by a fourteen page questionnaire administered by the Department of Rural Sociology to the total student body of the State College of Washington during the early part of the first semester of the 1952-53 academic year. Females were included because of their increasing importance in the labor force but are excluded from this analysis.

The questionnaires were self-administered. The students were asked to return them as soon as possible. For various reasons, many of the students failed to return their questionnaires. After October 31, 1952, the cut-off date, all students not returning the questionnaires were considered non-respondents. At that time, 1,586 students had responded, or approximately 32% of the student body total of 4,930 recorded immediately after formal registration. Of this number, 1,469, or 33%, of the undergraduate total of 4,449 had responded.

The analysis of data for purposes of this study deals exclusively with the responses of 741 male undergraduates. Those who were raised on a farm and/or were presently living on one were classified as *farm* (184); the remainder (557) were classified as *nonfarm*. Because these respondents were not drawn as a random sample the problem of non-respondent bias in generalizing to the undergraduate student body must be recognized. Nevertheless, since the statement of the findings discussed below presents a consistent pattern of differences, certain generalizations seem warranted.

---

<sup>5</sup> L. J. Elias, *Farm Youth's Appraisal of Their Adjustments Compared with Other Youths*, Washington AES Bulletin 513 (1949), p. 30.

<sup>6</sup> See also Herman M. Case and Walter L. Slocum, "Factors Associated with Three Postulated Stages Occupation Choice Behavior of College Students," *Research Studies of the State College of Washington*, Vol. XXI, No. 3, September, 1953. Herman M. Case, "Two Kinds of Crystallized Occupational Choice Behavior," *American Sociological Review*, February, 1954.

## RESEARCH FINDINGS

*Conception of College.*

The vast majority of the farm boys (92.2%) along with the non-farm boys (90.5%) cited *occupational preparation* as their main reason for coming to college. Other data, however, suggest that this does not necessarily mean that the farm more than the nonfarm boys consider college training to be of crucial importance. More farm (62.9%) than nonfarm boys (46.8%) believe that they could be happy on a job not requiring college preparation. Fewer farm boys (46.4%) felt that they needed the college degree to do the kind of work planned, fewer of them than of nonfarm boys were actually planning to complete college (although 90.7% of the farm boys and 94.3% of all boys had such plans) and fewer of them (57.%) said that they would be *very disappointed* if they didn't get the degree. The reverse is generally true for nonfarm boys. They, more (26.4%) than the farm boys (13.1%) would be unhappy on a job not requiring college preparation, more of them (62.8%) believed the degree to be important for the kind of work planned, more (95.3%) planned to complete college and more (71.0%) said they would be *very disappointed* if they did not get the degree.

*Evaluation of College Program*

Other data corroborate these findings. When asked what aspect of college life was most important to preparation for their life's work a majority of both groups answered *college courses*. But this response was given somewhat less frequently by farm (70.5%) than by non-farm boys (80.2%).

Elias, in his study of high school youth, found a similar situation. He writes:

"City youth were much more likely to express themselves as satisfied with their courses than were the rural youth. . . . This may be a reflection of the greater disinterest of rural youth in schooling as a means of implementing their future role ambitions. It may also be a reflection of their critical appraisal of the course content of the rural high school as they measure its adequacy against their knowledge of the demands to be made upon them in discharging future roles."<sup>7</sup>

In addition, when asked to assess the importance of college grades in relation to a future job, farm boys somewhat more (19.3%) than

---

<sup>7</sup> L. J. Elias, "An Analysis of the Roles and Social Adjustments of Over Four Thousand Five Hundred Seniors from Rural and Urban High Schools in Washington," Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, The State College of Washington (June, 1949), p. 165.



the other group (14.4%) felt they were hardly important to them. Moreover, farm more (70.2%) than nonfarm boys (55.8%) claimed enjoyment only for courses specifically applied to future vocation.

### *Plans for Graduate Study*

Data related to plans for graduate work are consistent with these above findings. While it is well accepted that graduate work, of all the academic training is unquestionably vocationally oriented, more farm boys (74.1%) generally do not plan to take graduate work than the nonfarm boys (67.4%). Moreover, of those planning to continue, fewer farm boys (59.3%) had made firm plans in this direction than nonfarm boys (77.0%).

The data generally suggest, then, that these farm boys look to college for occupational preparation but are less academically oriented; the need for college academic success and the college degree is less felt among this group. The nonfarm boys apparently feel a greater need for the degree<sup>8</sup> and other symbols of academic success.

This condition appears to exist in part because nonfarm boys indicate preparation for occupations which would demand the degree as a requisite for employment.

---

<sup>8</sup> These data would predict a situation in marked contrast to that found by Landis and Hatch in their 1942 study. Ten years ago, they found that: "Of the 1,097 students who entered the State College of Washington in the fall of 1936, only 317 or 29 per cent had graduated. Testifying to their greater persistence, rural-farm students graduated in larger proportions than did students from either of the other residence groups. Thirty-three per cent of the rural-farm students had graduated compared with 29.2 per cent of the rural nonfarm and 26.4 per cent of the urban students." Their data also indicated that rural-farm students tended to show "a greater improvement between first semester average and four-year average" than did the other residence groups. This datum is supported further by their finding to achieve significantly higher scholastic success than rural students."

Since the present study was less interested in college academic ability and more interested in the conceptions of and attitudes toward the academic dimension of college than was the Landis-Hatch study, a different theoretical and methodological approach was used. As a consequence, it is difficult to fully assess the implications of this apparent difference in the farm groups of both studies. For example, the fact that the earlier study showed the farm group as at least as capable if not more so than nonfarm, still leaves the possibility that that farm group was less academically oriented. Grades and the fact of lower college mortality are different criteria in this respect than are questionnaire data on conceptions and attitudes.

The data in the present study on intelligence and achievement (G. P. A.) are inconclusive. The nonfarm group tends to be higher than the farm on A. C. E. percentile rankings but lower on G. P. A. See Raymond W. Hatch and Paul H. Landis, "Social Heritage as a Factor in College Achievement," *Research Studies of the State College of Washington*, Vol. X, 4 (December, 1942), pp. 247, 256-257.



### *Choice of College Major*

A review of the college majors chosen by WSC students discloses a picture of relatively more nonfarm boys majoring in the physical and biological sciences, in the humanities, in social science, in economics and business administration, and in engineering.

The agriculture majors predominantly have a farm background and while completion of college work may be looked upon as an index of an agriculturalist better prepared to do his job than one without his degree, the degree itself is much less necessary for successful entry into his occupation.

More farm (39.2%) than nonfarm boys (25.2%), had not selected any major. This is difficult to explain. Part of the explanation is the fact that proportionately more of the farm boys were college freshmen than the other group. But this is not the only explanation. Examination of a more detailed rural-urban residence pattern indicates that more of the boys with "open-country" rural nonfarm background were freshmen (58.1%) than any other group. Yet, they were more decided about choice of college major (27.2%) than were the farm boys. Another possible explanation might have to do with the increasing shrinkage of farming opportunities for youth. Boys raised on farms may now find it more difficult than the other groups to make a choice of another occupation. The data here indicate that just slightly more than 50% of the farm boys had a farm available if they wanted to go into farming.

### *Certainty of Choice of Major*

This indecision about college major is also reflected in indications of certainty of choice of college major; only 42.5% of the boys said that they were *positive* that their current major was the one they really wanted. But more than farm (41.5%), nonfarm boys (43.5%) were *positive* that they really wanted their present choice of major. Again this finding must be viewed cautiously in light of the heavy farm weighting among college freshmen who might be expected to be more undecided. But it is difficult, nevertheless, to avoid the conclusion that there is more uncertainty among farm groups than among nonfarm in their conception of the academic role of college in preparing for their future.

Elias, in his study of high school youth, asked the question whether the youth knew what they wanted to get out of life. His data, like the data on these college students, indicate that "significantly more city youth are likely to have strong convictions and ready plans for their future than rural youth."<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Elias dissertation, p. 206.

*Reasons for Choice of Major*

Why did they choose their majors? Most of the boys (66.2%) said they *just liked it*, but the farm (70.6%) more often than the nonfarm boys (64.6%), gave this response. Since about a half of the farm boys were majoring in agriculture, partial explanation for this difference is the direct exposure to farm work by farm boys while on the farm. The fact that more farm than nonfarm boys were living with their parents when not at college indicates that the social conditioning process for them may be a more exclusively family-residential experience. Further, more farm (37.4%) than nonfarm boys (25.1%) indicated that their parents have been the most influential persons in connection with their occupational choices.

*Influence of Parent's Occupations*

In attempting to assess the role of parents' occupations on occupational plans, the boys were asked to note how they conceived of their father's occupation as the kind of work they would like to do. More farm boys (28.3%) rated their father's occupation as *ideal* than the nonfarm (10.4%). This datum adds to the picture of farm boys with an earlier and more direct exposure to the world of work, (71.3% of the farm boys compared with only 58.5% of the nonfarm had done paid work related to possible future vocation) who tend to like it<sup>10</sup> and as consequence of this, tend to find the general academic experience of college of less consequence in occupational preparation than do the other residence groups.

*Satisfaction with Major*

Farm boys who said they were generally *very* and *fairly* satisfied with their present major more (70.1%) than the nonfarm (59.8%) said they were satisfied because they *looked forward to work in a field related to this major*. Fewer farm (26.0%) than nonfarm boys (36.6%) professed satisfaction for their major on the basis of interesting and challenging subject matter. Again, the evidence suggests that these farm boys tend to be non-academically oriented in the

---

<sup>10</sup> Stott found that significant differences in adolescents' attitudes toward work was in part a function of residence. While "All the differences were considerably skewed toward the favorable end of the (Thurstone) scale, in terms of mean scores, the farm scored highest; the city, second; and the town lowest. The superiority of the farm home setting in regard to mean attitude score is... probably due... to certain advantages common to that setting... such as the family enterprise with which all members, early in their lives learn to become concerned, or the general background of attitudes toward industriousness and idleness in which the child is reared." H. Stott, *Personality Development in Farm, Small-Town and City Children*. Nebraska AES Bulletin 114 (1939), pp. 18-20.

traditional sense. While most of them came to college for occupational preparation, these farm boys tend to be relatively more uncertain of the function of general academic training in connection with future work. Data directly related to occupational choice argue for this conclusion.

### *Age of Occupational Choice*

More farm boys (27.7%) make serious occupational choice before the age of 14 than the nonfarm (21.9%). Even with regard to childhood conceptions of work more farm (33.8%) than nonfarm boys (24.1%) have an earlier reality orientation.<sup>11</sup>

In this regard Elias reports that the high school

"farm boys were most likely to consider themselves ready for adult responsibility . . . city boys are least likely to consider themselves ready. . . . It might be reasonable to attribute their greater confidence on the part of the average farm youth to his relative lack of conditioning in social experience of a more complex character. His social world is more likely to be a completely familiar one in which he is likely to know his place and his potentialities. The city boy, constantly adjusting to the complexities of urban life, is likely to have had such an experience as to make him a more realistic judge of his comparative ability to achieve mature living in a secondary group social climate."<sup>12</sup>

Elias also asked these youth about their readiness to take over the responsibilities of their father or mother if the need should arise. Again he found that farm boys more than any other group had greater confidence that they could manage their father's responsibilities. His interpretation has merit with regard to the college group as well.

"A possible explanation for these differences might be in the simpler definition of job responsibility for farm youth in the primary group structure of rural life. The more complicated definition of job responsibility in the complexity of the city's professional vocational structure may make these decisions for city youth a more serious problem."<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> Bright and Lively report that: Farm boys because of work experience about the farm are probably more mature and prepared for starting work at an earlier age than town and city boys of similar age." Margaret L. Bright and C. E. Lively, *Farm Youth in Missouri*, University of Missouri AES Bulletin, 504 (1947).

<sup>12</sup> *Elias' dissertation*, p. 200.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 202.

## SUMMARY OF RESEARCH FINDINGS

The data of this study indicate that *more* farm than nonfarm boys:

1. Cite "occupational preparation" as their main reason for coming to college
2. Believe they could be happy on a job not requiring college preparation
3. Feel college grades in relation to a future job are "hardly important"
4. Claim enjoyment only for courses specifically applied to future vocation
5. Say "just liked it" as main reason for choosing college major
6. Are living with parents when not at college
7. Indicate that their parents have been the most influential persons in connection with their occupational choices
8. Rate parent occupation as "ideal" for the kind of work they would like to do
9. Claim satisfaction with college major because they "look forward to work in a field related to major"
10. Make an early occupational choice
11. Have an early reality orientation to the concept of work
12. Have had more actual paid work experience related to future vocation.

The data also indicate the *fewer* farm than nonfarm boys:

1. Feel they need the college degree to do the kind of work they planned
2. Are actually planning to complete college
3. Say they would be "very disappointed" if they didn't get the degree
4. Feel college courses are aspect of college most important to preparation for life's work
5. Plan to take graduate work
6. Have firm plans for graduate work (of those planning)
7. Are majoring in fields related to degree-requisite occupations
8. Have selected any college major
9. Are "positive" they really want their present choice of major
10. Profess satisfaction for their major on the basis of "interesting and challenging subject matter."

## CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The foregoing data indicate that, among the students studied, farm boys are even more interested in the vocational aspects of college experience than nonfarm boys. With regard to the question raised in

this study, it appears that the academic aspects of college generally are somewhat less important to the farm boys than to the nonfarm.

A general summing up on this question might be answered in terms of the question raised by Landis and Hatch. They asked: "Are rural students, because of presumably inferior pre-college training and cultural backgrounds, handicapped in the college situation?"<sup>14</sup>

Considering the farm boys specifically and interpreting "handicapped" as meaning inability or unwillingness to exploit the academic experience of college to its full value in the process of choosing an occupation, the answer must be *yes*. Whether this means the socialization of these youth is "inferior" is a value judgment and somewhat beside the point. That the pre-college experience of farm boys is evidently not formative of a fully receptive attitude to the traditional academic institutions of college does appear to be the case.

It appears that the earlier contact with the world of work where *residence* is, at once, *occupation* for the farm boy makes the traditional academic rewards of college—marks, general "culture," degree, etc.—somewhat unrealistic goals.

While these findings cannot be considered definitive they may be of help to students of college curricula, to high school and college advisors, and to all persons generally concerned with realistically fitting the college academic life to the needs of the students and giving the student realistic appraisal of the nature of college academic life. Such a concern certainly can result in much conservation of human resources.

It is suggested that more research be applied to this problem to test the generalizability of the findings reported here. Such research might also be designed to test an hypothesis derived that: the earlier and more definite the occupational choice before college, the less important will be the cognition conventional symbols of academic success.

The findings of such research can also add to the growing body of systematic knowledge concerning the continued tenability (or not) of "residence as a factor" in behavior dynamics.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> Landis & Hatch, *op. cit.*, p. 219.

<sup>15</sup> See, for example, C. A. McMahan, "Personality and the Urban Environment" in T. Lynn Smith and C. A. McMahan, ed., *The Sociology of Rural Life*, New York: Dryden Press (1951), pp. 748-760 and Howard W. Beers, "Rural-Urban Differences," *Rural Sociology*, Vol. 18, 1, (Mar. 1952), pp. 1-11.

\* Assistant Director of Education, Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, New York.

## JEWISH SURVIVAL; A CULTURAL PARADOX

S. I. Spector

There was a period in the history of the United States when the weakening or even disappearance of minority cultures was expected. This was the golden age from the 1880's to the 1930's. In this era there was so much expansion and invention and minimum of social distance—particularly in the pioneering areas, so much wealth and opportunity to accumulate more of it, that assimilation of minority mores and character seemed inevitable. Yet in contradiction to this logic is the continued strength of Jewish organizational life.

The United States at this stage was a land of growth and opportunity. Population increased from 50,155,783 in 1880 to 122,775,046 in 1930. Distribution of Homestead Act lands, resulted in a great westward movement with consequent "lebensraum" and opportunity for all comers. Railroads followed the flux and consolidated themselves into a network that covered the country. New methods of farming boosted the quantity and quality of crops. Manufacturing grew apace and with it foreign trade. The successful conclusion of the Spanish American war, raised the stature of the United States as a world power. The utilization of the vast resources of natural gas, oil, minerals and waterpower added to the growing prosperity. Increase in labor opportunities afforded by various inventions such, as the automobile, airplane, cable and radio minimized economic tension and led to the rise and firm establishment of labor unions. Civil service reform opened more avenues for employment and advancement. Writers of the day, such as Lowell, Twain and Hearn showed hospitality and interest toward the Jews and for the most part were favorably disposed. Discrimination, social and economic, was at a low ebb.

What part did the Jews play in this great movement? Their numbers increased from about 200,000 to about 4,000,000. They were pretty well established in business and trade, were to a large extent urbanized, and were recognized as a force in the community. At the outset the Jews worked as peddlers, laborers and artisans. Later, they became storekeepers, merchants and bankers. Thus we find Seligman as banker to the railroads, Filene as the merchant prince of Boston, and the concentration of the garment industry in Jewish hands. The heavy settlement of Jews in urban areas made for their specialization in trade, but also brought them in contact with centers of culture. The community as a whole benefitted from the social services of Michael Heilprin, the theatrical productions of David Belasco, the nonsectarian charities of Jacob Schiff, the co-founding with Clara Barton of the American Association of the Red Cross by Adolphus



Solomons, the first free distribution of pasteurized milk by Nathan Strauss, the founding of the visiting nurses association by Lillian Wald, the public services of Oscar Strauss, the inauguration of Credit Union Associations by Edward Filene, and the benefactions of the Rosenwald Foundations to the Negroes. Jews participated as individuals in all of the cultural facets of American life. Thus Rebecca Kohut, in describing the activities of her father in San Francisco in 1880 tells how he wrote articles for local periodicals (*Chronicle*, *Argonaut*), was active in the prison reform and anti-vice crusades, urged the reading of secular papers, taught Christian clergy Hebrew and constantly invited non-Jews to his Seder services. In general, the position of Jews was favorable, and was aptly described by Henrietta Szold who in 1900 said, "In America, as in England, the happy political and economic conditions—happy from the point of view of the Jews' security and as compared with conditions prevailing elsewhere—give scope to a full development of the communal and religious life." We should expect that increased security and minimum of hostility by the majority would lessen this communal and religious life.

Certainly, the broad concept of Americanism or the majority culture should have made Jewish acculturation easy and thus should have weakened its internal organizational life. If we accept Rachel Dubois' definition of American culture as the product of various component cultures that emanated from the peoples who made America, it follows that there was no compulsion for the Jew to accept any particular part of it and much opportunity to add his bit. On the other hand, perhaps we should adopt I. James Quillen's concept of the American way of life as consisting of five basic values: to wit, faith in moral law, the ideal of the free individual, the team method of solving group problems and promoting common concerns, faith in reason, and faith in the mission of America. Here, too, it would not be difficult for Jews to adapt themselves.

The Jewish Bible is the foundation of universally accepted moral law, which the Jews have been studying and practicing for at least 2,500 years. The ideal of individual freedom is basic in the Bible, as evidenced in the interdiction against permanent slavery. Unfortunately, Jews have had to solve their problems in group and communal fashion because of their "ghettoization" and persecution. The practice of reasoning among Jews is clearly evident in the abundance of exegetical and philosophical treatises that were not necessarily limited to Judaism. Perhaps, the concept of Americanism should be treated historically. Was it the same in 1930 as it was in 1880? Did it consist of the tobacco spitting of the western pioneers, the rugged individ-

ualism that amassed wealth at whatever price, or the snobbery of the Boston brahmins? Or did it mean the religious and social practices of the large Anglo-Saxon majority that always made up the bulk of the population? There is so much room for interpretation that it is difficult to predicate an American culture that set standards either for groups or individuals.

The simplest consideration would be that of conformity. Did the Jews throughout the period learn to speak, read and write English? Many of the first generation did, as is attested by the popularity of Jewish Education Alliance on New York's East Side and the various public citizenship classes. The second and third generations certainly absorbed the language, for Jews are ever desirous of knowledge. Should all males have adopted the walrus moustaches so common to the 1890's? Certainly, the later generations conformed well. The public schools introduced Jewish children to American history, literature, games, foods, sports and manners. There was no difficulty in conforming here. If participating in civic and military affairs is meant, the record of the Jews was good. His law-abidingness was exemplary. His charities extended to non-Jews as well as to Jews. Four thousand Jews served in the Spanish American War. Increased physical development made Jewish soldiers in World War I good fighters. Where permitted Jews sought and served well in public office. In the business world, they accepted and practiced free competition, individualism, and the respect for wealth.

The foregoing is an attempt to indicate the elasticity of the concept of Americanism and the ease with which the Jew has been able to accept it. If this is so, he should have become less marginal and his organizational life proportionally weaker. But this is not the fact.

We must look for the reasons elsewhere. Four hypotheses are postulated as worthy of exploration. It is asserted that: (A) Jewish organizational life has remained strong because of the perpetuation of traditional institutions, (B) the dynamism of Judaism, (C) the quality of Jewish leadership and (D) continued pressure from without—both in the United States and elsewhere.

#### A

The first generation of immigrants invariably established foundations of a Jewish community. Although later there may have been some backsliding and defections, the institutions remained vital and hardy. The first institution founded was the synagogue. Although, it may have moved to different localities, split into splinter groups and weathered financial and membership crises, it was the center of religious, social and fraternal life. The second important institution

was the Hebrew school. Until the beginning of the twentieth century, these schools were usually adjuncts to the synagogue. With the influx of immigrants, publicly supported and private schools came into being.

In the 1930's, the Jewish Education Committee began to establish standards for curriculum and teaching. Sunday and parochial schools were soon added to the five day a week ones. The studies pursued usually consisted of Hebrew, Yiddish, history, the Bible and the prayer book. As would be expected, second and third generation children attended less frequently and received less training. But even these were brought back to the school when preparing for their confirmations, to the synagogue for marriage ceremonies or the need to attend daily services to repeat memorial prayers for deceased parents, and to the community for the services of the Mohel to circumcise their sons.

The third factor was charity. Its organization began with the synagogue where the sisterhood made it its business to provide food, fuel, maternity supplies, gifts and loans to the needy. Later, fraternal organizations such as the B'nai B'rith and the True Sisters entered the field. Then by amalgamation and superorganization, the community as a whole took over the function. Thus in the 1880's the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society was established to facilitate the coming and adjustment of new immigrants. A group named Am Olam (Eternal People) was founded to settle immigrants on farms. The Baron de Hirsch Fund also helped in this direction. In 1896, the Jewish National Farm School was established. With the organization of local institutions (Beth Israel Hospital) and national tuberculosis sanatoria, the scope of charity spread. Few Jews remained untouched by the various calls, and even nonobservant individuals were linked to the group by charity.

The desire for Kosher food was another group solidifier. To meet the constant demand (in varying degree) for Kosher meats there was perpetuated the ritual slaughterer and Kosher butcher. The large packing houses set aside special sections of their abbatoirs for the Jewish trade. Rabbinical supervision was extended to other food products so that they could be used by Jews on a much wider scale. This would be true for vegetable shortening, for instance. Perhaps in the annual celebration of Passover, when the use of unleavened food was prohibited, was Jewish consciousness most emphasized. The eating of Matzos and Metzto products provided for a different diet and a large manufacturing service to cater thereto. Mention should be made of the Kosher restaurants, delicatessen stores and catering establishments.

The observance of Sabbath and other festivals has also helped maintain Jewish group feeling. During the High holidays (New Year, Day of Atonement), the synagogues were usually filled to overflowing. The Seder nights of the Passover festival left joyous memories. This is also true of the booth used during the Succos holiday and the special foods that accompany some of the less important days of celebration (pancakes during the Feast of Lights). Although the observance of the Sabbath decreased during the years, there was always the hard core of the faithful. But the Sabbath meals always had their attraction. And to this day, even non-Jewish restaurants serve Chaloh (Sabbath white bread) and gefulte fish for the Friday delight of their Jewish patrons.

Finally, there is the matter of the creation or recreation of other institutions. East European immigrants brought with them their Yiddish. This caused the establishment of the Yiddish theater which has survived until today. It also led to the publication of such Yiddish newspapers as the Daily Forward, which on one hand served to help Americanize the immigrants and on the other, perpetuated their group identity. In 1888, the United Hebrew Trades Union, the first Jewish trade union, was formed. In 1892, the American Jewish Historical Society came into being, to be followed seven years later by the Jewish Publication Society. In 1893, the National Council of Jewish Women was formed along with the Jewish Chatauqua Society, whose purpose it was to disseminate the knowledge of the Jewish religion. The Federation of the American Zionists was organized in 1898 by immigrants who were so minded before their coming to the United States. In 1901, the Jewish Encyclopedia saw the light of day, because of the indefatigable efforts of Isidore Singer. Five years later the American Jewish Committee was established to help ameliorate conditions of the Jews in various parts of the world. The year 1909 saw the founding of Dropsie College in Philadelphia, the beginning of Jewish teacher training and the translation of the Bible into English. Some years earlier, the Menorah Society was formed to stress the cultural aspect of Judaism to Jewish college students. Its quarterly magazine, the Menorah Journal, was first issued in 1915. Three years later, the American Jewish Congress was founded as an organization of organizations. Chairs in Hebrew studies were established at Harvard (1925) and Columbia (1929). The introduction of other Jewish Collegiate groups such as Hilel (Bnai Brith) and Young Zionists fought influences that seemed to wean Jewish students from their faith. Of extreme importance were the *landsmanschaften*. These were fraternal, charitable and social groups, composed of first and second generation immigrants from various localities. Their social activities, sick benefits

and provision burial plots made them a cogent force among Jewish institutions.

## B

The dynamism or flexibility of Judaism was a powerful factor in maintaining group identity. Judaism, as a way of life, had a place for its followers. The most observant adhered to a rather rigid code that prescribes for many daily activities, while the least observant rejected most of the rites and ceremonies. Yet the latter were always considered Jews and were entitled to religious privileges. If Judaism were a barren brittle theology, it would have disappeared many years ago. Even though the passing of time showed a division in thinking (belief) and practice, there was no great detriment to the faith. Most of the immigrants were orthodox in their faith and practice. They were able to impart knowledge to their children, but not necessarily observance. The result was a shading in ritual. Thus in 1885, the Pittsburg platform for American Reform Judaism accepted Mosaic moral laws and such ceremonies that would elevate and sanctify life, but rejected those precepts that regulated diet, dress and priestly (levitical) purity. This resulted from the influence of Kaufman Kohler and I. M. Wise. To counteract this defection, Sabato Morais and Alexander Kohut founded the Jewish Theological Seminary to preserve the practice of historical Judaism as expounded in Biblical and Talmudical writings. In 1896, the Rabbi Isaac Elchanon Talmudical Academy was brought into being to perpetuate strict traditional Judaism. Thus, three major groups made their influence and variableness felt in American Jewry—the reform wing, represented by the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, its training institution, the American Hebrew College and its rabbinical group, the Conference of American Rabbis; the conservative wing, represented by the United Synagogue, its training institution, The Jewish Theological Assembly and its rabbinical group the Rabbinical Assembly; and the orthodox wing, represented by the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations, its training institution, the Rabbi Isaac Elchanon Talmudical Academy, and its rabbinical organization, the Union of Orthodox Rabbis. The first holds that many Mosaic and Talmudical laws are at variance with American life; the second maintains that some compromises should be made; and the third asserts that all traditional observances should be honored. All three groups are active and alert, and in times of crises, have acted in common. The surprising feature is that although many of their activities have been duplicatory and often at variance, their existence seems to have strengthened Jewish group consciousness.



## C

Jews have been fortunate in having leaders of skill and means available at all times. This becomes quite evident when we connect institutions with their promoters. This is best done, perhaps, in chronological fashion. When the influx of Russian Jewish immigrants made for difficult social and economic conditions, Michael Heilprin rose to the challenge. Jacob Schiff, too, gave much of his influence and fortune to alleviate this distress. Emma Lazarus, the poetess, also answered the call and gave the immigrants spiritual and practical comfort. Through her efforts the Hebrew Technical Institute was set up in New York so that the refugees might be trained in technical arts and trades. When Jewish persecution in Russia became more aggravated, and the United States government, fearful of a new avalanche of immigrants proposed restraints, Simon Wolf pled their cause before the officials in Washington successfully. To meet the evils of increasing exploitation of new immigrants by grasping employers, Samuel Gompers aided in the organizing of the United Hebrew Trades group. Judge Mayer Salzburger was the guiding inspiration for the Jewish Publication Society which issued many excellent books of Jewish interest. Cyrus Adler was instrumental in establishing the American Jewish Historical Society and set standards for American Jewish scholarship. Partly in answer to rejection of ideals of Zionism by Reform Jewry and partly because of enthusiasm engendered in Richard Gottheil by his attendance at the first World Zionist Congress in Basle, the Federation of American Zionists was born with Stephen S. Wise and Harry Friedenwald as able midwives. In 1902, Solomon Shecher was brought to America to revive the Jewish Theological Seminary and give new impetus to Jewish scholarship. The Kishineff and other pogroms in Russia aroused a new sense of kinship between American and European Jews and led to the formation of the American Jewish Committee by Mayer Sulzburger, Louis Marshall, Judah Magnes and Cyrus Adler. The American Jewish Congress was militantly led by Mitchell May and Stephen S. Wise. The high quality of the Menorah Journal was maintained by Henry Hurwitz for many years. Louis Marshall rose to the challenge of Henry Ford's Dearborn Independent's mouthings of the Protocols of the Elders of Zion and announced the magnate's public apology. Following World War I, Louis Brandeis was the guiding star of American Zionism. Throughout this period, Stephen S. Wise was the great and staunch defender of Jewish causes whenever and wherever they arose. He was the dynamo of the Zionist Organization of America and the American Jewish Congress. Although in the forefront of all American Jewish life, he was its interpreter and representative to the American non-



Jewish citizenry. He fought equally for general civil rights and the implementation of democracy. So, here, too we see the integration in one man of the ideals of Americanism and Judaism, in which a strong Jewish spirit was furthered in a milieu of an active American life. With a galaxy of such leaders, Jewish organizational life perforce was kept at a high level.

## D

Continued pressures from without were perhaps the greatest single factor in the preservation of Jewish communal organizations. First were the recurrent persecutions of the Jews in Eastern Europe, particularly Russia. They were responsible for waves of immigrants to the United States. These individuals, coming in the main from an orthodox Jewish environment, maintained their traditional religious and social life in the sections in which they settled. Thus in the 1880's, two hundred thousand Jews emigrated to America from Austria, Roumania and Galicia. In the years 1900-1910, continued anti-semitic agitation in Europe sent 1,500,000 immigrants to the United States. Indeed from 1905-1914, six hundred fifty thousand Jews from Russia alone came to our shores. Chaotic conditions in Europe and after World War I led to another influx of Jews from Eastern Europe, so that from 1915 to 1924 about 350,000 of them secured admission.

Two other external factors served to accentuate Jewish group feeling. One was the Kishineff pogrom in 1903. When the details of the atrocity were made known, the moral fiber of the American Jews was shaken to the core. Mass meetings were held all over the country and President Theodore Roosevelt was importuned to make representations to Russia. A huge mock funeral was held on New York's East Side. American Jews considered that pogrom a threat to their own security. The other factor was the sad plight of the European Jews during and after World War I. To alleviate the sufferings and distress of the Jews, who were hardest hit, the Joint Distribution Committee was organized. This group, which still exists as part of the United Jewish Appeal, appealed to all classes of Jews for speedy aid. Millions of dollars were collected and applied to the relief of the unfortunate Jewish war victims. In this effort, the *landsmanschaften* (groups of recent arrivals from specific localities) did yeoman work. Misery once again brought the Jews together.

From within there were several incidents that served to heighten Jewish consciousness. One was the famous incident of the Grand Union Hotel in Saratoga, New York. In 1877, Judge Henry Hilton, executor of the A. J. Stewart estate, of which the fashionable Grand Union Hotel was part, decreed that no Jews would henceforth be accepted as guests. This affected Joseph Seligman, the Jewish banker,

who had previously enjoyed the hotel's facilities without hindrance. A quarrel between Seligman and Hilton ensued. It made front page news in Metropolitan and other periodicals. Henry Ward Beecher publicly espoused the cause of Seligman. The A. T. Stewart store (later Wanamaker) in New York City was boycotted by Jew and non-Jew alike. When the furor had subsided, American Jews felt all the more the need of group solidarity. The other cause celebre has already been alluded to. Unscrupulous parties were able to influence Henry Ford to permit the publication of the scurrilous and spurious Protocols of the Elders of Zion in his Dearborn Independent. The false claims of an international Jewish conspiracy began to appear in 1921 in newspaper and pamphlet form and continued until 1927. Representatives of all Jewish religious and social groups, such as the American Jewish Committee, the Zionist Organization of America, Bnai Brith and others issued counter replies. The American Jewish Congress which was about to dissolve decided to remain as a permanent organization. Through a suit that had little direct connection with the issue, the machinations of the Dearborn Independent were exposed. Mr. Ford then made his famous public apology. During the time, Jewish sensitivity was kept at fever pitch.

#### CONCLUSIONS

We have now reached the end of our explorations, and some conclusions are in order. It cannot be assumed that group identity lessened in any way the participation of Jews, as individuals or groups, in the American economic, political and cultural life. Second, since Jews were scattered all over the world and since what threatened them in one place was considered a threat to the whole people, it was to be expected that there would be variations in the intensity of Jewish group feeling from time to time. Any threat of danger seemed to unify all factions for joint action. Third, the permanent organization of Jewish communal life in terms of its religious, charitable, fraternal and civic institutions kept Jewish identity alive without seeming contradiction to the so-called conformity expected by the majority "culture." Fourth, the absence of a definite clear cut concept of American culture made it easier for Jewish organizations to survive and flourish. No majority dictate, for example, demanded the abandonment of dietary laws. Finally, it is not clear that the complete absorption of this Jewish group life into that of the majority would have been to the best interest of either. Even if this were beneficial, it could not be obtained until the majority guaranteed social equality.

Dr. Samuel I. Spector is a Social Studies Teacher in the New York City Schools.